

Appl. No.: 09/661,214
Amdt. dated March 11, 2004
Reply to Office action of January 20, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant received the Office Action dated January 20, 2004, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-30 as obvious over a combination of Nord (U.S. Patent No. 5,600,793) and Tetrack (U.S. Patent No. 4,570,220). In this Response, Applicant amends claims 1-2, 13, and 22. Based on the arguments and amendments contained herein, Applicant believes all claims to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Amended claim 1 recites a method for communicating¹ information that comprises, among other limitations, "locking a communication link that comprises a plurality of data lanes" and "handshaking across the locked link to indicate readiness for data transmission by sending a first training sequence that contains a lane identifier of at least one of the plurality of data lanes." The art of record does not teach or even suggest the combination of the above-cited limitations. More specifically, Nord teaches a process that begins by "signaling the sending data processing system that the receiving data processing system is ready to receive data." Abstract, lines 4-8. Nord does not teach or even suggest handshaking across a locked link by sending a first training sequence that contains a lane identifier of at least one of the plurality of data lanes, as required by claim 1. Tetrack teaches that "if a requesting bus agent desires to initiate a data exchange along the parallel bus, it asserts a bus request (BREQ) signal and transmits a digital code corresponding to its unique agent arbitration number." Col. 2, lines 32-36. As can be appreciated by one of ordinary skill in the art, a bus request signal is not a training sequence, and an agent arbitration number is not an identifier of a data lane. Thus, a hypothetical modification of Nord by Tetrack, even if feasible, would not result in the claimed combination. Amended claim 1 finds support in the Applicant's specification at least at page 138, lines 9-13, page

¹ Applicant replaced the word "communication" with "communicating" in the preamble to correct a grammatical error and not to narrow the claim.

Appl. No.: 09/661,214
Amdt. dated March 11, 2004
Reply to Office action of January 20, 2004

139, lines 5-9, and in Figures 72-73. Thus, the art of record does not anticipate nor render obvious the invention of claim 1 and dependent claims 2-12.

Amended claim 13 is directed to a method for training links between ports that comprises, among other features, "transmitting a first training sequence from a first port and a second port, wherein the first port and the second port are configured to send and receive data on a plurality of data lanes, and the first training sequence contains a lane identifier of at least one of the plurality of data lanes." As explained above, Nord and Tetrick do not teach or even suggest sending a first training sequence that contains a lane identifier of at least one of a plurality of data lanes. Thus, the art of record does not anticipate nor render obvious the invention of claim 13 and dependent claims 14-21.

Amended claim 22 is directed to a method for training a link that comprises, among other features, "configuring a first receiver in a first port using a first training sequence or a second training sequence, wherein the first port is configured to send and receive data on a plurality of data lanes, and the first training sequence contains a lane identifier of at least one of the plurality of data lanes." As explained above regarding claim 1, Nord and Tetrick do not teach or even suggest sending a first training sequence that contains a lane identifier of at least one of a plurality of data lanes. Thus, the art of record does not anticipate nor render obvious the invention of claim 22 and dependent claims 23-30.


Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims. If any fees or time extensions are inadvertently omitted or if any fees have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Hewlett-Packard Company Deposit Account Number 08-2025 and enter any time extension(s) necessary to prevent this case from being abandoned.

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicant may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may

Appl. No.: 09/661,214
Amdt. dated March 11, 2004
Reply to Office action of January 20, 2004

be other distinctions between the claims and the prior art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan M. Harris
PTO Reg. No. 44,144
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400